

Terr file

H 5244

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 8, 1985

into any statistical report, yet it may extend for generations.

Dr. Roux spent 6 weeks abroad, traveling to cities in Egypt, Greece, Cyprus, Yugoslavia, Italy, and Turkey. His warm reception in each country shows that the splendor of music overcomes political differences. Often traveling into the provinces of these countries as a Musical Ambassador for the United States, Roux gave many people who have never seen this country perhaps the most vivid impression they will ever have of the United States.

The American Embassy in Yugoslavia reported that after 3 days in the country, Robert Roux's "superb skill as a pianist, his ability to achieve a rapport with students, and his unassuming, affable personal style made him an exceptional effective representative of the United States and the Artistic Ambassador Program."

The American Embassy in Egypt stated, "Robert Roux was an outstanding success both as a pianist of great technical ability, expression, and sensitivity and as a fine teacher. He is very gracious and understanding but at the same time thoroughly professional."

In Greece, the Embassy noted that Roux "made a strong and very positive impression during his stay in Greece." Cyprus relayed that "his visit to Cyprus was described by the Cypriot Musical Community as a complete success and they would welcome him back any time in the future." Italy reported that "Roux, an absolutely splendid pianist, was a grand success." Finally, the American Embassy in Turkey stated that "his brilliant technique and exquisite musicianship won over his audiences, while his gentle, knowledgeable teaching style earned him high praise from conservatory students and teachers alike."

I want to emphasize that Robert Roux is an outstanding citizen of Wichita as well as the United States. His willingness to serve his country as an Artistic Ambassador makes me proud. I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Robert Roux for personally bringing the people of the world closer together through the magic of music, and my thanks also go to the U.S. Information Agency for initiating this unique and rewarding program.●

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ANNUNZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DEFEATING TERRORISM, THE ART OF WAR, AND THE LESSONS OF HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk on defeating terrorism,

the art of war, and the lessons of history.

I choose this moment to talk about this because there is a great deal of attention being paid currently to terrorism and, unfortunately, we as a country tend to focus only on the immediate. We tend to focus on this week's crisis, this week's problem, this week's hostages; but, in fact, there are certain basic rules of history, there are certain basic rules of the art of war which have to be examined if we are going to successfully defeat terrorism.

It is fascinating, for example, to go back and look at a book entitled "International Terrorism," edited by Benjamin Netanyahu, and the "Proceedings of the Jerusalem Conference on International Terrorism", published by the Jonathan Institute, Jerusalem, 1981.

It is very sad to read day by day what was a conference held from July 2 to July 5, 1979, on terrorism, because, as you read example after example of the necessary steps to fight terrorism, the things that should be done, steps that were proposed by a wide range of people from West Germany, from Holland, from France, Great Britain, Ireland, Italy, the United States, Israel, and you then look at recent news magazines, recent reports, one thing you can conclude is that we in the West, between each crisis, between each headline, have managed to avoid learning the fundamental lessons.

□ 1250

I think it is important that the Reagan administration, the news media, and the elected Members of the legislative branch take the current energy and attention of the American people, the moment in which people are still thinking about the recent hostage crisis, the period in which the problem of terrorism is still close to the top of our agenda, and apply that energy to learning the basics, to fundamentally establishing new approaches and new systems for winning the war against terrorism.

In fact, I would suggest that the Reagan administration should not undertake single step actions whether diplomatic, economic or military. It is not vital whether or not we close the airport in Beirut. It is not vital whether we manage reprisals against the two terrorists who were on the airplane when the American sailor was killed. It is not vital that any single thing happen. What is vital is that we avoid tactical activity which gives the weight and illusion of doing something without the long, difficult process of thinking through the dangers and difficulties we face.

In other words, we Americans are often so eager for a solution that we reach out for any action which makes us feel good without having thought through the process. What is it going to achieve? Where are we going to get?

Clausewitz warned of this tendency over a century ago. In "On War," the greatest modern treatise in the art of war, Clausewitz warned that, and I quote:

No one starts a war or rather no one in his sense ought to do so without first being clear in his mind what he intends to achieve by that war and how he intends to conduct it. The former is its political purpose; the latter is its operational objective. This is the governing principle which will set its course, prescribe the scale of means and effort which is required, and make its influence felt throughout, down to the smallest operational detail.

In recent years, all too often the national security bureaucracy, the State Department, the Defense Department and the National Security Council have undertaken short-term tactical actions which were too large to be elegant and effective, and too small to be massive and effective. Both Desert I and more recent activities in Lebanon; the Embassy bombings, the Marine barracks bombing and the retaliation raid with two aircraft shot down and an American pilot held as a prisoner of war in Syria, should serve as a warning that the bureaucracies have failed at small operations for the last 11 years, and are likely to fail in the current crisis.

It is vital that the President ask four tough questions of the national security bureaucracies:

First. What are the strategic goals for which we are willing to risk the lives of our sons?

Second. Assuming our opponents are tough, dedicated and competent, what steps can they take to counteract and withstand our strategies? If phase I fails, what are the costs to the United States? What would a phase II require to assure American goals are achieved despite our opponents' counterefforts? American defeats in the Bay of Pigs, Vietnam, and Lebanon in 1983 were all in large part caused by failure to answer these questions prior to committing forces.

Third. What institutional and legal changes are necessary to enable the United States to effectively wage war on terrorism? Now is the time to repeal the liberal welfare state prohibitions on intelligence agencies, on police training the Third World, et cetera.

Fourth. How can the President and his allies act systematically to develop popular and political legislative understanding of and support for a long-term strategy which can defeat terrorism? In a free society, the most important and powerful Presidential reaction to today's events is to use them to educate the country to support tomorrow's actions.

It is possible to build a pattern of firmness, preparedness, and toughness strategically without taking immediate tactical actions involving force. Eisenhower, on numerous occasions in the 1950's and Kennedy in the 1961 Berlin

July 8, 1985

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 5245

crisis, were successful in building a show of force without using force.

In Sun Tzu's phrase, "The greatest of all generals win bloodless victories." Our first goal should be mobilizing American power, educating the American people and passing decisive changes in our national security laws. Then, if we still have not achieved success in the Lebanon hostage situation, we will be a peak of political, military and diplomatic readiness to use overwhelming force with overwhelming public support to achieve a clearly stated strategic goal.

Rescuing the current hostages without developing public understanding and support for a long-term strategy, will lead to a short-term success and a long-term failure. Recent terrorist actions in El Salvador, Germany, and Lebanon are merely the tip of an iceberg. It is vital we not accept a tactical solution to a strategic problem. Developing and implementing a long-term solution will be the key to defeating terrorism. It is to Clausewitz being clear in his mind what he intends to achieve, and how he intends to achieve it that we must first direct ourselves.

To understand our goals and our opponents, we have to be very clear on how we think and the language we use. Sun Tzu warned 2,500 years ago, in the "Art of War," "Know the enemy and you have won half the battle; know yourself and the battle is yours."

However, to know the enemy or yourself we have to be very clear about the language we use. George Orwell warned in his essay "Politics and the English Language," and I quote:

If thought corrupts language, language can also corrupt thought. A bad usage can spread by tradition and imitation, even among people who should and do know better.

The point that Orwell is making is that if you describe terrorists, for example, as freedom fighters, you clutter the ability to think through what is happening. If you worry about the whole process of language, you begin to understand why the news media, even when it is being sincere, is often being destructive. If you allow the terrorists to propagandize, to insert in Western thought their values, their reason, their argument, you make it difficult for us to understand how to deal with terrorism.

It is fascinating to look at the work of a French intellectual, Anne Kriegel, professor of sociology at the University of Paris at Nanterre, she studied the issue of public opinion, intellectuals and terrorism in Western Europe, and in this 1979 conference in Jerusalem on dealing with terrorism, she said that there were three reasons European intellectuals find it very difficult to deal with terrorism, and I think they are fascinating in the context of why we in America are having a hard time. She said:

Its first source is the uncertainty about the extent of what is meant by terrorism.

She went on to say:

The second source of the perplexity is the uncertainty regarding the degree of significance and seriousness of the terrorist scourge.

She said:

The third source of perplexity is the uncertainty as to a remedy.

In each case, by not being able to think clearly, European intellectuals, in Kriegel's opinion, were able to figure out a way of avoiding responsibility. Let me quote, I think, her most damning statement about Western intellectuals.

It is in seeking remedies that the propensity of intellectuals to play tricks with reality is revealed. As uncertain about the nature of limits of terrorism as they are about its significance, in short, about both the diagnosis and the prognosis, they are naturally uncertain about the proper remedy against terrorism.

Since they have not the slightest intention of taking real responsibility for evil, they find it comfortable to devote themselves to observation and denunciation of the possible excesses of any repression. This is a shrewd position, because in the end for these sort of people, all repression is excessive.

She goes on to say, and I quote:

All countermeasures must be accompanied by a concerted intellectual attack bearing on the totality of the issues likely to supply the terrorists with a semblance of legitimacy and rationality. But this concerted effort should be conducted not with the terrorists, but with the general public. To believe as the French Government wrongly did for some time, that the delay in the development of Corsica could be the subject of negotiation not with the Corsicans elected by universal suffrage, but with the clandestine representatives of the separatist-terrorist movement proved itself to be counterproductive.

Democracy is weakened when it is not respected, and when men who refuse to submit to the electorate, or when they do submit receive a pitiful handful of votes are dealt with as interloquers. When, as in Corsica, electoral democracy is imperfect, it should be improved rather than pushed aside for the benefit of what is, in essence, anti-democratic.

□ 1300

What is she saying? She is saying, and I close in terms of quoting Kriegel:

It is terrorism as a criminal act and not as the expression of an opinion, which is the object of social repression.

Kriegel's point is this: The Western intelligentsia has found a very sophisticated and subtle way of avoiding responsibility for dealing with danger. In fact, the Western intelligentsia, because it is leftwing, apologizes for and explains away much of modern terrorism. This was stated succinctly by two Americans, Peter Collier and David Horowitz, in the Washington Post and reprinted recently in Reader's Digest in an article entitled "Reflections From Yesterday's Radicals." They said:

We have said goodbye to all that, to the romance with corrupt Third Worldism, to

the casual indulgence of Soviet totalitarianism, to the hypocritical anti-Americanism, which is the New Left's bequest to mainstream politics.

It is fascinating in terms of what they talk about in their description of what they saw as the old leftwing radicalism of the 1960's. They describe it "as an era of bloodthirsty fantasies."

I was reminded of Collier's and Horowitz' article when someone got up here on the floor today and said as a major step toward defeating terrorism, and they then described actions inside the United States. I was fascinated because it is clear to anybody who has a reasonable view, I think, of the world that most of the terrorism on this planet is not caused by Americans, is not inside the United States, and is not a function of American behavior.

In fact, I think in order to defeat terrorism, we must start by defining it. Terrorism is not guerrilla warfare or a variation of freedom fighters. Few things have made me more angry than a recent effort in a debate I was in on television by an apologist for the terrorists who began by describing the Afghan freedom fighters as terrorists. Afghan freedom fighters tried to kill Russian invaders. They are primarily active against Russian military or the pro-Russian Afghans who are now in the Russian puppet army.

To describe Afghan freedom fighters in the same sentence as a terrorist is a deliberate effort to distort the argument and to smear the freedom fighters who are anti-Soviet, while at the same time protecting the pro-Soviet terrorists.

Terrorism is the deliberate killing of civilians in order to terrify. Terrorism asserts the right of a minority to use force randomly to kill people because of the superior claim terrorists have on history and morality. Terrorism is tied to totalitarianism in that each seeks to use force to change human behavior.

There is a very real parallel between Leninism, the use of force by the state to force you to change your behavior, and terrorism, the use of force by individuals or small groups to make you change your behavior. On the one hand, totalitarianism is the systematic terrorism of the individual by the state apparatus; on the other hand, terrorism is the use of force by the few to impose their will on the many.

It is vital that politicians, diplomats, and the news media be precise and clear about the specific nature of terrorism. Terrorism is in many ways parallel to the Soviet KGB. It is the deliberate act by some to inflict pain on others in order to have their way. Terrorism is a political action by a determined minority seeking to psychologically brutalize the majority by physically brutalizing the innocent.

Terrorism in its modern form goes back to Russians secret societies in the late 19th century. Terrorism can be defeated. It has been suppressed in the

H 5246

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 8, 1985

past and can be again in the future. To defeat terrorism, we must recognize three realities:

First, modern terrorism is largely international and can be defeated only on an international level.

Second, modern terrorism is largely a political-military activity and must be defeated in a political-military context.

Third, modern terrorism is waging war against civilization and can be defeated only by accepting the reality of that war.

Let me make this point very clear, because it is at the heart of my message.

Warfare occurs at four levels in their hierarchy. The bottom level is tactical, what happens every day. The level above that is an operation or project, how do you put together your tactics to achieve something. The level above that is a strategy, what are you trying to accomplish with your operations or projects, and the top level is a vision, where are you trying to go with your activities.

It is very clear that the higher up you are in that hierarchy the better off you are. If you have two sides competing and they are both equally good tactically, the side which is operationally superior will win. If you have two sides which are competing and the side which is operationally superior is strategically inferior, it will lose. At the ultimate level, vision defeats strategy.

For example, in the American Revolutionary War, George Washington had a superior vision and a superior strategy, but the British had a better army. In the long run, the British army's better operations and tactics lost to the Americans' better vision and strategy.

Interestingly, in Harry Summers' classic work, "On Strategy: The Vietnam War In Context," Summers makes the point that it was the Americans who had the operationally and tactically superior army, but it was the North Vietnamese who were better off at the vision and strategy level. He begins his book with a conversation in Hanoi, April 15, 1975, in which Summers said:

You know, you never defeated us on the battlefield.

The North Vietnamese colonel pondered this remark a moment.

"That may be so," he replied, "but it is also irrelevant."

Summers was in North Vietnam at that point as part of a delegation and it was that comment, the North Vietnamese who said, "That may be so, but it is also irrelevant," which sent Summers back to studying Clausewitz and looking at the issue of strategy. What he concluded was that if one side has a superior strategy for fighting the war, the other side will lose even if it wins all the battles.

Let me apply this to the issue of defeating terrorism. Terrorism on a global basis, as George Will has put it, is was against the Americans. But it is

more than that. It is war against the democracies. It is fascinating to note that terrorists almost never attack totalitarian states. There is very little anti-Soviet terrorism, but there is a great deal of anti-American, anti-British, anti-Italian, anti-French, anti-German, anti-Israeli, and now anti-Salvadoran terrorism. The reason is, first of all, the terrorists hate democracies. Terrorism is, by definition, based on the right of individual fanatics or small groups of fanatics to decide what they will do. These fanatics, by definition, are contemptuous of the concept of democracy. They are contemptuous of the concept that the majority should have something to say, and they regard our activities, our efforts, as laughable. It is in their interest to destroy America.

The one thing which holds together the Irish Republican Army, the various terrorist factions in Lebanon, the terrorists in El Salvador, the terrorists who work in the Palestine Liberation Organization, is a common understanding that while they may disagree on the future they want, they agree on their enemy. Their enemy is the West, their enemy is the United States, their enemy is the concept of democratic society.

We have to recognize that they are linked together, that they are not just tactical events such as the seizing of an airplane or operations such as the 2-week horror is the hostage crisis in Lebanon. There is a bigger, broader strategy, which is to deliberately use force to terrify Western democracies, to prompt their governments into one of two habits: either impotence or the destruction of repression.

This happened, for example, in Uruguay a number of years ago. Uruguay was the best democracy in South America, the cleanest government, the freest society, the most open news media, and urban guerrillas called the Tupamoras began a deliberate, vicious campaign of urban terrorism and decided that they could destroy the democracy and in 3 years cause such destruction that in order to survive as a country, the military were given overwhelming power, the police were given overwhelming power, and what had been the best democracy in South America, in effect, gave up its democratic rights to suppress the terrorists.

So the terrorist strategy is either to scare us into being impotent, do nothing, or to force us into overreaction and repression. In either case, the terrorists win.

□ 1310

If we react only tactically, that is, each time the terrorists do something, we do something, I think we are in the long run doomed to fail. Furthermore, if our only reaction to their tactical aggravation—they steal an airplane, they seize hostages, and we then launch an operation, one raid, one activity, cutting off the Beirut airport—is doing one thing, I think we still fail.

because if all we are doing is reacting to their specific action, they retain the initiative; we are on the defensive, we are in a reactive position, and furthermore they have time to study us.

The world is big and complicated. The American Secretary of State or the American President is not going to pay attention full-time to terrorists in El Salvador and terrorists in Lebanon. So if they take a step in June and we react in July, we forget what they are doing because we are busy with 25 other problems. They have 6 months to study us, and then next year their next terrorist action is more sophisticated. Look, for example, at how sophisticated this action was, with a plane seized in Athens, carried to Algiers, flown to Beirut, carried to Algiers again, moving back and forth, staying busy, with all sorts of intermediaries, and with the American press and news media being manipulated and the television networks being manipulated. It was a very sophisticated terrorist operation.

We are now dealing with people who are well trained, trained in South Yemen, trained in Libya, trained in Cuba, trained in the Soviet Union, trained in little universities of terrorism or colleges of terrorism. In order for us to respond effectively, we have to establish a vision of how we are going to act. We have to recognize certain basic principles which are going to drive our actions, and we have to recognize that our actions have to occur on several levels. They have to occur with intelligence agencies, with diplomacy, with the military, with the news media, with countering our own leftwing thoughts, and with educating the American people, and only by having all these layers of action are we going to be in a position to win.

The first step has to be to describe our vision of the world we want to live in. I think that should be fairly clear. We do not want to get revenge against one terrorist group for one terrorist action. We do not just want to slow down terrorism in one region. It is vital if the West is going to survive that we invent a positive system of activity which allows us to dominate and suppress terrorism before it hurts the innocent. In the long run we are going to have to build a sophisticated enough intelligence and police capability that we are able to know what the terrorists are going to try, stop them before they do it, and that we are going to be able to know where they got their support from and how to defeat that support.

Let me suggest that this leads us first to the intelligence agencies. And again I might suggest that it is fascinating if you read the Conference on International Terrorism from the Jonathan Institute, or if you read Charlie Beckwith's study, "Delta Force," on his efforts to create the counterterrorist unit in the U.S. military. In both books there is a consistent pattern of

July 8, 1985

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 5247

how the leftwing "ostriches" in America in the 1970's crippled the intelligence agencies, with the fact that when Iran disintegrated and began to move into a fanatic phase, we simply did not have the human intelligence capability left to know what was going on. In fact, we had to ask one man to come out of retirement to help infiltrate to understand what was happening in Iran.

Again and again international experts from across the planet in the conference at Jerusalem decried the cutting up of the American Central Intelligence Agency by leftwing "ostriches." It is eerie in 1985 to go back and study the 1979 conference on the things that were done to weaken the American intelligence agencies.

The first step of the Reagan administration should be to come to Congress to ask for a dramatically strengthened intelligence capability, and, second, to go to our allies to propose the establishment of international efforts to systematically coordinate an offensive against terrorism.

The second step should be to recognize that terrorism is by definition international. If all we were worried about were local ethnic groups that had a grievance or local ideological "nuts" that had a grievance, we would not be very worried. Those can be handled by the normal police powers of any average state. But when, for example, shipments of up to 5 tons of ammunition and weapons are sent from one country to another to help terrorists, when we discover that the Soviet Union has terrorist training camps in the Crimea that have 60 trainees at a time, when we learn that in Libya there are five divisions of equipment sitting there to be shipped around the Third World for terrorists to use, when we study the way in which terrorists network and help each other, when we look at the relationship between Syrian terrorists and the Soviet Union, we have to recognize that international terrorism is big business and that international terrorists are systematically allied to defeat the West and to cripple democracy and destroy the United States as an influence in the world.

In that setting I think we have to distinguish between two kinds of states: first, states which actively direct terrorism—and that would include Libya, Iran, and apparently on occasion Syria—and, second, states which actively support terrorism. These states would almost certainly include Syria and would probably include the Soviet Union and would also include South Yemen, where much of the training is carried on. I want to draw that distinction because we need to adopt very different reactions to the two sets of states. So on the one hand we have states that are directly leading terrorism, and on the other hand we have states which are supporting terrorism.

Third, I think we have to recognize geographic areas which do not exist anymore as states. To talk about Lebanon as though it were a country is to deceive ourselves. It goes back to George Orwell's point about the importance of language. Lebanon does not exist as a country. Lebanon is a geographic area which has 17 different ethnic and religious factions fighting for control. When we pretend Lebanon exists as a country, we set up expectations which guarantee that we are going to be frustrated and have a difficult time dealing with Lebanon. Instead, what we ought to say is "Look, if you have no government, we are not going to pretend you do. If you are incapable of policing yourself and suppressing terrorism, we are not going to pretend you are." The rules of sovereignty which apply to countries that are organized do not apply to areas that are essentially battlegrounds for piracy.

So the first rule in the international agencies ought to be that we have one set of actions aimed at countries that are directing terrorism, one set of actions directed at countries that are supporting terrorism, and one set of actions for areas that really are not countries at the present time but are only geographic terms for battlegrounds between terrorist factions.

In that setting we have to look then to diplomacy in the State Department. Let me suggest that in order to combat terrorism, we are going to have to adopt new rules based on new language with a new recognition of reality. The first of the new rules is that in order to be effective against terrorism, we are going to need to establish an alliance against terrorism. We cannot expect the United Nations to be effective because by definition the United Nations as a global institution includes terrorist organizations. Libya, for example, is a member of the United Nations. Yet Libya clearly and openly says that it is committed to terrorism, it is committed to war against the West, and it feels perfectly reasonable in attacking the Americans.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciate very much the gentleman's well-thought-out statement. However, on his views of the United Nations, I would think that the United Nations would be preeminently the place where we would want to go and stamp out terrorism. After all, if the United Nations is not going to stamp out terrorism, what can we depend on the United Nations for?

The gentleman talks about geographic areas. I think he is absolutely correct, and that is why we have to understand that terrorism knows no boundaries, it knows no international law. That is why the United Nations has to be involved, and I would think

we would work through the United Nations and expel those nations that do not live according to the dictates of the United Nations.

□ 1320

For example, when our hostages were taken into Lebanon, I do not think the United States or the President of the United States should have had the responsibility of getting the hostages out or bringing them back home. I think that should have been within the prerogative of the United Nations, precisely because it is the world court of world opinion.

So I would think the United Nations should have some obligation in this area.

The gentleman talked before about where we are going to assess blame in our intelligence agencies.

Well, I remember distinctly when the 39 hostages—the 40, pardon me—when the plane was hijacked, a Member of the other body, a very liberal Member, was on national TV and he condemned the CIA for not having the information that we needed at this time.

Also, during the Carter administration, Stansfield Turner, head of the CIA, said that we do not need on-the-ground information, that because of our satellites, et cetera, they will act as a substitute and we do not have to put people's lives in jeopardy and in danger by sending them into a country that is not friendly to us.

So I think by emasculating the FBI, which we did just a week and a half before the hijacking took place and the CIA and then turning around and pointing fingers at the intelligence agencies as though they were responsible I think is totally illogical.

I do not think that we can exonerate people who vote one way in one direction and then turn around and point fingers because the CIA or the FBI did not have the capabilities to give adequate information and proper information to the President of the United States. I think we cannot lose our historical perspective.

I apologize to the gentleman for asking him to yield some time, but I would have to say that we have to look at the importance of the United Nations, especially when it comes to the issue of terrorism, and that we cannot point fingers at the FBI and the CIA, when we in this Congress are responsible for emasculating those intelligence-gathering agencies.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. GINGRICH. Well, if I may respond to my good friend and say, first of all, I agree there is something bizarre about leftwing ostriches who may well have participated in the assault on the Central Intelligence Agency in the late seventies, who now turn around and discover in amazement that the very intelligence agen-

H 5248

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 8, 1985

cies that they helped cripple are in fact now very, very necessary.

I am fascinated again in the conference in Jerusalem on terrorism. Lord Chalfont, who is a very distinguished British and journalist, and who is a member of the Labor Government, not a conservative, made the comment: "Even the CIA, damaged and demoralized as it has been by an orchestrated and systematic attempt to destroy it in recent years."

Now, this is in 1979. Every American should think about this term, "damaged and demoralized as it has been by an orchestrated and systematic attempt to destroy it in recent years."

Part of the leftwing ostrich assault on the intelligence agencies was precisely to cripple the human intelligence and covert operations capabilities which we now find against terrorism are invaluable.

Let me say to my friend from Wisconsin that there are three parallel diplomatic offensives that are necessary. Yes, we should go to the United Nations. In fact, this administration should have demanded a Security Council meeting. We should insist on an aggressive effort to get the United Nations to condemn terrorism, but we should also recognize that the forces that hate the West have a large enough block in the United Nations that they will cripple the United Nations.

I think largely for the education of the Western public and the Western news media we should always be on the offensive diplomatically at the United Nations. You and I should recognize in advance that offensive is going to fail; that in fact the United Nations has a large enough block of proterrorists, prototalitarian, pro-Soviet, anti-American, antidemocratic, and anti-Western forces, that the United Nations is helpless to provide a real arena for the development of a global strategy to defeat terrorism.

Second, I would like to suggest that the United States should move actively to develop an alliance against terrorism. We should seek those from our NATO allies in Europe, from Canada, from Japan, from any country which is willing to pledge itself to actively being involved in an effort to defeat terrorism at a vision and strategic level.

In addition, we should undertake an association to prevent terrorism, which is passive. I want to distinguish the two. There are many countries around the world which would be willing to say up front that they will, for example, allow the United States to apply to seize a terrorist who is hiding in their country, that they will ensure that that terrorist is sent to the United States.

There are many countries that will say legally they will not accept terrorism, holding hostages at an airport. Those countries should be asked to passively help defeat terrorism and they should belong to an association.

The alliance against terrorism should be an activist force, should say very aggressively—and I will get to some of those activities in just a moment—that we are going to stamp out terrorism. We are going to take those steps which are necessary to make life very risky indeed for the terrorists, and that includes active retaliation and, indeed, preemptive strikes.

There is a big difference in the risk that is involved and in the strength of the country. A country which is poor and weak and may well be frightened of terrorism itself might join the association against terrorism and say that they will do passive things to stop terrorists, whereas a country that is confident of its strength—West Germany, Great Britain, and Italy—might want to join an alliance against terrorism dedicated to very active steps to drive terrorism out of existence.

I would suggest that we should then state explicitly, "If you don't belong to the association and you are not passively against terrorism and you don't belong to the alliance and you are not actively against terrorism, you are then not part of what we would regard as the sanctuary of Western values."

We should say very clearly that if a terrorist is on your territory and you are not willing to allow us to file to extradite them and you are not willing to seize them, that we then reserve the right to protect ourselves by going after that terrorist.

This is a fundamental shift, I think, in the American approach to international law since World War II. We have to recognize that international law, which provides Libya with a sanctuary while putting Americans at risk, is a foolish approach to international law. An international law that pretends that Lebanon is a real country, when it is a battlefield, is a foolish approach to international law.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for just a brief comment, and that is this. In theory that sounds great, but how does this work in practice?

For example, we have in El Salvador now rebels who no longer have the support of the people. We know that. The rebels themselves admit that; but we have Members from our own body who are going down there and sanctioning what some of these rebels are doing, or helping, giving them some credibility.

So if Members of this body are going to do it, how are we ever going to get to the steps that the gentleman wants to take?

I am not denying that the gentleman's steps are not appropriate. I think they are. I am just trying to analyze how we are going to get from here to there.

Mr. GINGRICH. Well, I would say to my friend that the greatest of all

burdens in a free society is to win the war of public opinion. The most important message I would have for the Reagan administration is that until they have thought through the war against terrorism, until they are prepared to engage the ostriches in our body who systematically run around here and I think try to deny the reality of a dangerous world, until they are prepared to win the struggle for the minds of the American people, they are not prepared for the struggle against terrorism.

Once the American people come to the conclusion that something has to be done, we can do it.

I was frankly heartened in an unusual way. I went back and studied the war against the Barbary pirates at the time we were a brand new country. Thomas Jefferson, as Ambassador to France, began dealing with the Barbary pirates in 1785. Many Americans, many Members of the Congress when we became a country in 1789, said, "Oh, let's appease them. There are ways to appease them."

In fact, it will hearten all of us, we actually passed a bill to build four ships for the Navy, with the provision that if the Algiers pirates would negotiate, we would not finish the ships. I mean, those are shades of the debate we have nowadays. It is exactly the same pattern.

There is always an ostrich faction that says, "You know, if only you are nice enough to the terrorists, they won't terrorize you."

Ultimately, it took from 1785 to 1802, ultimately we educated ourselves. We came to believe that we had to take serious steps, and we took serious steps.

Now, I am suggesting that the State Department steps are very fundamental. We have to establish new rules for international law as it relates to terrorism. We have to establish a new alliance against terrorism. We have to establish a new association for the prevention of terrorism.

We then have to impose very, very severe sanctions at three levels. First, states direct terrorism, in my judgment, have to become battlefields. We have to say to Libya, "If you are going to direct terrorists, we are not just going to protect American hostages in Beirut. We are going to come after you."

Second, States which support terrorism have to be at risk at least economically and diplomatically. We should seriously consider cutting off all aid of any kind, including indirect aid through the United Nations, to any country which refuses to extradite terrorists.

Third, those countries that want to be able to stand to one side, they do not support terrorism and at the same time they do not direct terrorism, have to understand that they are closed out of the loop, and frankly, our allies, the French are one of the worst offenders.

July 8, 1985

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 5249

The French have a number of Italian terrorists who they are unwilling to extradite to Italy and they are unwilling at the present time to imprison. That is a terrible precedent.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for just 30 seconds, I see what the gentleman is saying. I think the gentleman is right on target.

The point that the gentleman made about the leftwing propaganda war, which is the all important war, the war for people's minds. I think is correct; but I think, my good friend from Georgia may agree or not agree, I think the reason is that many times, the left wins by default. For example, when the CIA was attacked for not having information that they were supposed to have as far as Lebanon was concerned and the Shiites and the like, the media hauled out Stansfield Turner. Now, he is one of the people who helped emasculate the CIA, and yet when the media went to the CIA, there was no comment. There was never a comment from the CIA.

□ 1330

Do you not think that we should have some sort of maybe an institutional readjustment where we do have political offices for the CIA, FBI, so when charges are made against them that they will and can respond if we are in a court of public opinion?

Mr. GINGRICH. I think you have made a suggestion which has a lot of merit.

The point I would like to make is that the intelligence agencies, whether it is the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Central Intelligence Agency, back before the leftwing ostriches took control of the Democratic Party and politicized American foreign policy, there was a bipartisan spirit which led to a tradition that said we are not going to say anything, that the intelligence agencies and the law enforcement agencies are above politics.

Now, in the modern era, that has frankly not been true. Ever since the rise of George McGovern and the emergence of the leftwing ostrich as an ideological force in America, we have seen a greater and greater willingness to attack the intelligence agencies and attack them both ways, as the gentleman points out. First you gut them because they are too strong, and then you attack them because they are too weak. There is a certain amount of historical shortsightedness and I guess it is part of why I wanted to do this outline today, to say, look, you have got to look at the long run. There is something, as the gentleman says, bizarre about calling on Stansfield Turner, who is the man who gutted human intelligence in the Central Intelligence Agency, to talk about the Central Intelligence Agency. It is a

little like going to your local bartender to discuss the problems of alcoholism.

The fact is these people were the problem. It is the ostriches who crippled the Agency which we now have to rebuild.

But I would carry it a stage further. I think the intelligence agencies ought to have every Thursday morning a briefing on Capitol Hill for every Member of Congress, of everything which is not classified which has been gathered around the planet, on the Soviet war against the West, on the terrorism so that every Thursday morning the executive branch would brief every Member of Congress who wanted to come about everything we have learned in the preceding week about terrorism everywhere on the planet and about the Soviet war against the West. And I think frankly the same day, maybe at noon or 1 o'clock they should brief all of the news media so that we begin to build a historic memory, a historic understanding of what is going on.

But for this to happen, frankly, the State Department is going to have to understand that we have got to tell the truth to the American people. We have to tell the American people the truth about Soviet involvement in subsidizing and supporting terrorism. We have to tell the American people the truth about the weakness of the United Nations, not that we need to get out of it, but that we need to be honest about what has happened to the United Nations, that it is now frankly, a battlefield. It is not a sanctuary for law. It is an arena in which forces like Libya and forces like Syria and the terrorists have as much influence or almost as much influence as the Americans.

Finally, at the diplomatic, military level, let me suggest that we should specifically make an example of Libya and Cuba, Cuba and the Western Hemisphere in Africa, Libya virtually across the planet. They have been the two primary agencies directing terrorism, and I think that rather than simply deal with the persons at the tactical end of the battlefield, that one or two terrorists out there with a grenade or rifle, if it began to be obvious to Libya and Cuba that there were great costs involved in supporting and directing terrorism, you would see a dramatic fall-off.

There are a number of military actions that are possible, but let me suggest one as an example of how far we are going to have to think this thing through. We know and monitor terrorist training camps around the world. We know there are at least two terrorist training camps, for example, in Libya.

Our current position is look, if you think you want to be a terrorist, and you go to your local terrorist recruiting office, which is very often the Palestine Liberation Organization local terrorist public affairs office, and they are all over the planet, many of the

western democracies have PLO offices which are, in effect, recruiting grounds for terrorists. You drop in and you say, gosh, I would like to become a terrorist. You would not use quite that language, but you would say you would like to become an activist, and they then send you off to a training camp. You go literally, the Libyans, according to one report, literally rent their camp out for so much money. You bring your gang, you show up and they give you 30 days of training, plus food, and they also provide ammunition and weapons, and you get to take the weapons when you leave as a graduation present. It is a fairly expensive training program, but then all you do is kidnap a major businessman, hijack an airline, rob a couple of banks and you raise the money.

If you think that is an exaggeration, note, for example, that the Communist dictator in Nicaragua, Ortega, was in jail in the 1970's for being a bank robber. He was a terrorist, or as part of his training as a good Communist, he was learning how to rob banks to finance the revolution.

In that setting, what is the Western position? Do we stop you by closing up the local PLO office? Oh, no, they are allowed to be open.

Do we stop you when you get your passport and your tickets, and you get on an airplane to fly to Libya or Cuba, or the South Yemen to get training? No, we will let you go.

Do we stop when we know that there are 70 of you sitting around in a camp being trained to be terrorists? No.

Do we stop the guy who trains you? No.

When do we finally stop you?

Well, we may or may not stop you after you have committed terrorist acts, after you have had the hostages, after you have humiliated us and showed up on television around the planet. Then we may or may not get you.

Let me suggest this is incredibly stupid, that only a society that is willing to go to the ultimate extreme allows its enemies to publicly say they are your enemies, to publicly say they want to destroy you, to publicly recruit people who want to kill you, to train those people, arm them, organize them and then only after they try to kill you to react.

One of the steps we would suggest just as an example for us to think about is that at some point in the near future if we are going to be serious about winning the war against terrorism, an international force, preferably out of the Alliance Against Terrorism, or some such organization, should occupy two or three terrorist training camps, because the minute we do that, the minute Libya, or Cuba, or the South Yemen begin to realize that if you have a terrorist training camp in your territory you are potentially going to be exposed to great danger, you are going to see a dramatic change

H 5250

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 8, 1985

in their willingness to openly train terrorists. The minute that having terrorists in your territory becomes grounds for reprisal, for example, if we know that Libya has a number of organized terrorist groups occupying hotels in Libya right now, we can legally, legitimately, through the State Department ask for their extradition. If they refuse to extradite, we have every legal right to impose an air and sea blockade on Libya until they give up the terrorists. That begins to make it expensive.

Now we should not do this randomly. We should think through, and remember again the clause, the injunction that I began with, that we should think through every step of making Libya an example of how we in the West have decided we are not going to tolerate a war against democracy. We should take every step necessary to either eliminate Qadhafi's regime or make them behave respectably.

But for you to pretend that Qadhafi, while he supports terrorists, while his agents firing from an embassy kills a British policewoman, and Qadhafi's reaction is to threaten to hold every Britain in Libya hostage, not to apologize, not to turn over the killer, not to promise that he will clean up his government, but in fact to turn and do the opposite and say, sure, we killed your policewoman, so what. If you bother us, we are going to hold every person from Britain in our country hostage, and then the British did nothing, and nothing will happen until we recognize that we are engaged in a war.

But that also means, by the way, that the news media has an obligation. If we are going to retain freedom of the press, we have to retain a free society. One step the President should take is invite the great magnates of the media to lunch, the owners of the major newspapers and news magazines, and leaders of the major television networks. At the luncheon, he should ask them to establish a professional review board to undertake these four steps:

First, to review the recent crisis and look at how we were manipulated, how the press and the media were manipulated by the terrorists.

Second, to look at the lessons of free countries such as Germany in dealing with hostage crises.

Third, to look at establishing a new set of professional rules for covering future crises.

This does not have to involve censorship. It could involve, for example, something as simple as every television network having before and after every hostage news program a serious discussion and explanation of the psychological problems of being a hostage. If the average American had been told in advance that there is a clear syndrome by which a hostage identifies with the captor, that we literally know with the Patty Hearst case and others that once you see

somebody and hold them long enough, they identify with the people who are terrorizing them.

Once you see that you will understand and you can sympathize with whatever the hostages are saying. If it has been explained carefully, for example, "You are now about to see a press conference set up by terrorists in which people who were being terrorized will talk, knowing that the terrorists could shoot them if they say the wrong thing; please watch everything with that information in mind."

At that moment you will have stripped the terrorists of all their propaganda advantage. Simple professional rules of the game can dramatically improve the sophistication of the news media in dealing with the hostage crisis.

Finally the news media themselves should recommend legal changes to the Congress. There are three areas where we need to consider seriously changing the law and these proposals should come from the professional news media rather than from politicians.

First, what should happen if the news media endanger innocent people, the hostages? Let us say that a newsman learns something but knows that if he goes on the air the hostage will be killed; should the hostage's family have the right to sue that organization for the deliberate killing of their loved one? Should the news media be liable because they literally caused the death of that innocent individual?

Second, what about our troops? It is fairly clear that in the age of television it is literally possible that a newsman will learn that, for example, a Delta team is moving in to attempt to steal a Russian airplane. What if somebody decides they are going to break the story and five of our soldiers are killed as a consequence? Should their families have legal liability against the news organization? Should they then be able to say "My husband" or "My father died because you broke secrecy"? Should rules of secrecy apply?

Would anyone really argue that in 1944 the news media had the moral and legal right to break the Normandy invasion story before Dwight Eisenhower said it was OK? Would it really have been appropriate? Is that kind of censorship only appropriate in time of war? In which case, should the news media recommend to us, for example, that Congress should pass a declaration of war against terrorism so that those ground rules would be underway?

Finally, what if they endanger secrets?

It is fairly clear, for example, that in the news media coverage of the German actions in Somalia in the 1970's that a very powerful device which confused and upset the terrorists was revealed by the news media, that in fact, a secret device which had been invented by the Germans which

was very, very effective, was revealed to every future terrorist; that in fact if you are a terrorist you do not need to have an intelligence agency, you just need to buy the news magazines. You do not have to invest in an awful lot of spies; you just have to subscribe to the daily newspapers. You do not have to have a large, elaborate network set up to report back what is going on; you just turn on your TV set.

To what extent should we be looking systematically, with the advice and guidance of the professional news media, at rearranging the rules of the game so that specifically as it relates to terrorists and to hostage situations we establish far more sophisticated rules of engagement?

Finally, let me suggest that as the executive branch looks at all this it has to recognize that the structures established under Presidents Truman and Eisenhower are now inadequate. The great bureaucracies of national security are simply not functioning very well. We are going to have to rethink how we exist in a very, very dangerous world.

I would like to suggest, in closing, that the Western democracies are not going to survive for another 50 years if we allow at the margin the Soviet Union to systematically plot our destruction and we allow at the margin every group in the world that hates democracy to get away with every cheap shot that they can think up. If it continues to be acceptable to kill four American marines in El Salvador and nothing is done, if it is acceptable to kill an American sailor in the Middle East and nothing is done, if Americans, Britains, French, Italians, Germans, Israelis, anybody who lives in a free society is a hostage to terrorists, that terrorism is accountable to no one, then nothing will be done.

In closing let me say in particular to our friends in the news media, you possibly more than anyone have a vested interest in understanding what has happened. For you must recognize that in fact, without a free society there would be no free news media; that the first people killed in a totalitarian state are the very intellectuals and reporters who thought it was exciting that leftwing tyrannies were being established.

We will only survive as a free people if we educate ourselves, if we look seriously and candidly at the dangers of terrorism and if we establish a division of strategy level, a general structure within which to wage war on terrorism.

For this administration or this Congress or this Nation to rush off to two or three activities, to close the airport at Beirut, to go out and kill one or two terrorists, to seek out one or two acts of reprisal might be satisfying in the short run; in the long run they will not defeat terrorism.

In the long run what we need is a international strategy for the defense

July 8, 1985

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 5251

of democracy, the destruction of terrorism, an international alliance against terrorism and a willingness to seriously commit ourselves to a 5-, 10-, or 15-year war if that is necessary to ensure that in the end it is the free people, the democracies who survive, and it is the terrorists who shall have perished.

I thank the Speaker.

DEMOCRATIC RADIO ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE MARY ROSE OAKAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, MARY ROSE OAKAR of Ohio, used the Democratic radio address last Saturday to present a clear and honest account of the budget issues facing Congress and raised the issue of fairness in the President's tax reform proposals.

It was an excellent statement which I introduce into the RECORD for the convenience of my colleagues:

DEMOCRATIC RADIO ADDRESS OF CONGRESSWOMAN MARY ROSE OAKAR, JULY 6, 1985

(Following is the prepared text of Congresswoman Oakar's remarks in response to President Reagan's radio address:)

Hello. This is Congresswoman Mary Rose Oakar. I represent Cleveland, Ohio, and am Secretary of the Democratic Caucus of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. President, on this 4th of July weekend, all Americans join with you in being grateful for the hostages' safe return and pledge to work with you to prevent a recurrence.

We celebrate the 209th birthday of our country this holiday weekend. On July 4th, 1776, the members of the Continental Congress approved the Declaration of Independence.

An eloquent document that embodied the aspirations of our forefathers for tax justice and political freedom heralded our beginning.

What makes the 4th of July such a special holiday is that these ideals have proved so enduring. They are as relevant today as they were two centuries ago as our Nation undertakes the historic effort of framing a new federal income tax system that is fair to all.

It is only fitting that we talk this weekend about you and your taxes.

We Democrats stand ready to cooperate with the President in fashioning a tax bill that meets the true test of fairness: a tax bill that gives real relief to middle-class families who have homes and children who aspire to a higher education.

How we treat the middle-class families of the Parmas, Petersburgs, Peorias, and Portlands of America will be the real measure of our success.

The President's tax package is not fair to the middle-class. It's as simple as that. It's our job as Democrats and Americans to make it fair.

When you cut through the speeches and the hoopla, you see clearly that the President's plan shifts the tax burden once again onto the middle-class.

Middle-income families who have worked to achieve success would be stuck with an even higher tax tab.

Let me give you some examples:

Middle-class families where the husband and wife work would be hit hard by the loss of the two-earner tax deduction, commonly known as the marriage penalty. The President's bill would eliminate it.

This deduction was put in the tax law to offset the higher tax married people pay on their combined income. The two-earner deduction is a matter of fairness.

Its repeal would mean that two-income families would end up paying much more in taxes than under the current law.

Two-wage earner families would also be hurt by the loss of the credit for child-care expenses. Many families today pay a great deal each month to the babysitter or day care center so that mother and father can work. They need the extra income to save for their vacation, their children's education, or just to make ends meet.

The President's plan would convert the existing credit for child care into a tax deduction. This would reduce the taxes of affluent families—those who least need another break—much more than the taxes of low and middle-income families.

In addition, middle-class taxpayers would be hurt by the loss of the deduction for state and local taxes. This deduction, which the President would eliminate, has been part of our country's basic tax law since 1913.

It ensures that you are not taxed twice on your hard-earned income.

As President Reagan said two years ago, repeal of the state and local tax deduction would mean "you'd pay tax on a tax." He was right then. Let's hold him to his word now.

To the millions of you who are homeowners, it would mean that you would not be able to deduct your local property tax.

Those of you who want to buy your first home may find it out of reach because you had planned on taking the state and local tax deduction to make your monthly payments affordable.

These changes that the President wants would put the squeeze on the middle-class taxpayer and family. He wants to eliminate those tax provisions that lower your taxes.

Finally, the President's tax plan would add to the deficit in the future. We all know that the record deficits run up by this Administration have a devastating impact on the middle-class.

The colonists threw the tea into Boston Harbor in 1773 to make the point that taxes should be fair and just. We fought for our independence to protest taxation without representation.

Today, the message must be the same. I want you to know that the Democrats hear you.

Let us, your elected representatives, know whether you want a tax bill that is in the spirit of the American Revolution—a bill that gives real relief to the middle-class and requires all Americans to pay their fair share.

Mr. President, we Democrats stand ready to work with you on tax reform. But we want it to be fair to America's majority—the middle-class.●

TERRORISM AND THIRD WORLD FREEDOM FIGHTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN), will be recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. LUNGREN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I took a special order for the purpose of discussing a recent article by former President Richard Nixon called "The Case for Supporting Third World Freedom Fighters."

But before I do that I would like to make some comments on the previous special order of the gentleman from Georgia dealing with terrorism.

One of the things that it seems to me is absolutely clear and one thing that he made reference to is the fact that terrorism is in fact a state of War, under different terms and under different words, and unless we recognize that it is a state of war, those who engage in terrorism will take advantage of democracies of this world and they will continue to do so, much to our disadvantage.

We who believe in a rule of law, because we do not recognize the nature of terrorism, find ourselves constrained by an international law that the terrorists do not recognize.

In most countries, all those democracies of the world who do believe in the rule of law, recognize exceptions to that law during times of warfare. There is conduct that is allowed during times of warfare, when warfare is recognized, that are not allowed in other times, no countenanced by those governments. And until we begin to recognize the essential difference of terrorism from random violence without an intention and from organized, state-conducted and state-recognized warfare, we will be at a disadvantage to the terrorists of the world.

One of the things that the gentleman from Georgia did not refer to specifically is one the restraints that has been placed on the CIA. There is a restraint that has been involved in several administration which does not allow the CIA to involve itself in something known as assassination. That grows out of the previous practice, well, the alleged rampant practice of assassination engaged in by the CIA when it was called a rogue elephant and when it was brought to heel by congressional committees.

I am not one who wants us to return to those days of alleged actions but it does seem to me to be a concern of us that terrorists use the difficulty that we in determining who is involved in a particular terrorist attack against us. In other words, the very uncertainty, the very ambiguity that terrorists have, that they involve themselves in, is a protection against the organized countries of the world retaliating against them. It just seems that perhaps some uncertainty practiced by ourselves would be to our advantage. That is, if we attempt to determine who it was who killed the American Navy man who was aboard the TWA flight and killed him only for one reason, that is he was an American serviceman, if we can determine their identity and if we can determine their location and if the governments of the